

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6, and 8-37 are pending in this application. Claims 11-19 and 22-37 are withdrawn from consideration.

By this Amendment, claims 4, 20 and 21 are amended to include the subject matter of claim 7, claims 1-4 and 6, and 8, 9 and 20 are amended for clarity, claim 7 is canceled, and claim 8 is amended to change its dependency from canceled claim 7 to pending claim 6. Thus, no new matter is added by this Amendment.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments:

(a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) do not present any additional claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

A. **Tatsuji, Fullerton and Meyn**

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over JP8-153104 (Tatsuji), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0033296 (Fullerton) and U.S. Patent No. 5,859,623 (Meyn). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed in the April 14, 2005 Amendment, Tatsuji does not disclose the source file recited in claims 1-3. Tatsuji discloses a hyper-editor 15 that converts a first hypermedia document into a second hypermedia document for a presentation (that is, a plurality of cards). Please see paragraph [0027] of Tatsuji. A display order of cards for a presentation is

determined on a list display screen that displays all of the cards, and the display order of the cards is then saved as scenario information. See paragraph [0032] of Tatsuji.

The June 1, 2005 Office Action asserts at page 3, line 8-9 that Tatsuji teaches image files and "source files" including pagewise scenario information and image information. However, the Office Action fails to provide any evidence to support this conclusion.

In addition, the June 1, 2005 Office Action asserts at page 3, line 14-16 that Fullerton teaches two different predetermined file formats. However, Fullerton only discloses that presentation data streams includes different data or media types, and does not disclose that "the image files of the first predetermined format" is generated "on the basis of the image information" included in "the source file of the second predetermined format," "the first predetermined format being different from the second predetermined format," as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, the June 1, 2005 Office Action asserts at page 4, lines 1-3 that Tatsuji and Fullerton disclose "file icon" for a source file of a second predetermined format including pagewise scenario information and image information. This assertion appears to be based on the above discussed misconception of the "source file." However, as discussed in the April 14, 2005 Amendment, a plurality of cards of Tatsuji do not include scenario information, so the plurality of cards of Tatsuji are not the "file icon" for the source file of the second predetermined format, as recited in claim 1.

Still further, the June 1, 2005 Office Action fails to indicate which portion of Fullerton allegedly corresponds to the "file icon" recited in claim 1.

Meyn was cited as disclosing dragging and dropping a file over an icon in order to execute a function. However, Meyn discloses that information generated by a presentation application software is converted into a PDF file. Please see col. 10, lines 49-67 of Meyn. However, Meyn does not disclose that the information generated by the presentation

application software includes scenario information. Further, Meyn et al. discloses that only a PDF file is created from the information generated by the presentation application software, and thus provides no disclosure of the feature of "creating a scenario file from a source file" and the feature of "generating image files from a source file", as recited in claim 1.

According to the features recited in claim 1, the user only has to drag and drop a file icon for a source file of a second predetermined format on an execution icon for causing a scenario creating section to execute a scenario creating process, so as to create a scenario file and image files of a first predetermined format with ease.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Tatsuji, Fullerton and Meyn, in any combination, fail to render obvious the subject matter of claim 1.

With respect to claims 2 and 3, Applicants respectfully submit that at least the features recited in claims 2 and 3 similar to those features recited in claim 1 are not taught, disclosed or even suggested in Tatsuji, Fullerton, and/or Meyn. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Tatsuji, Fullerton, and/or Meyn fail to render obvious the subject matter of claims 2 and 3.

Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. Tatsuji in view of Fullerton

Claims 4, 10, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tatsuji in view of Fullerton. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4, 20 and 21 are herein amended to include that the selected source file information includes page indicating information indicating a page in the selected source file.

Tatsuji discloses that scenario information is created according to the arrangement of four cards. See paragraphs [0057] and [0058] of Tatsuji. However, Tatsuji fails to disclose that the selected source file information includes page indicating information indicating a page in the selected source file, are recited in each of claims 4, 20 and 21.

Fullerton fails to remedy the deficiency of Tatsuji.

For the foregoing reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Tatsuji and Fullerton, alone or in combination, fail to render obvious claims 4, 20 and 21, and claim 10 dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

C. Tatsuji and Fullerton and Meyn

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tatsuji and Fullerton and Meyn.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 is canceled. Thus, with respect to claim 7 this rejection is moot. Each of claims 6, 8 and 9 depend directly or indirectly from claim 4. Thus, each of claims 6, 8 and 9 is allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 4. That is, Tatsuji and Fullerton and Meyn, in any combination, fail to disclose that the selected source file information includes page indicating information indicating a page in the selected source file, as recited in claim 4.

Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/bdh

Date: September 1, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--